

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Claims 7-9, 22 and 25 have been amended in several particulars only for purposes of clarity and brevity that are unrelated to patentability and prior art rejections, in accordance with current Office policy, to further define Applicants' disclosed invention and to assist the Examiner to expedite compact prosecution of the instant application.

Claims 2-11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 27 and 28 have been conditionally allowed if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims 1, 17, 22 and 25. The Examiner's indication of allowability of these claims is noted with appreciation. However, in view of the foregoing responses and submissions, Applicants believe that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 7 and 8 have been objected under 37 CFR §1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 4 and 5. The Examiner's attention to detail is noted with appreciation. In response thereto, claims 7 and 8 as well as claim 9 have been amended to avoid duplication and redundancy.

Lastly, claims 1, 12, 13, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 26 have been provisionally rejected under 35 the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 19, 20, 29 and 31 of co-pending Application No. 10/624,597 filed on July 23, 2003 (Docket # 1670.1011) in view of Yamazaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,433,487. In support of this rejection of claims 1, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 26, the Examiner asserts that Applicants' co-pending Application No. 10/624,597 discloses all of the limitations of these claims, except for the use of a flexible printed cable within an EL display device, as allegedly disclosed by Yamazaki '487. However, the Examiner's assertion is incorrect. Notwithstanding the fact that Yamazaki '487 does not disclose that the Examiner alleges, there are other limitations in each of base claims 1, 17, 22 and 25 that are not disclosed or suggested in Applicants' co-pending Application No. 10/624,597. For example, Yamazaki '487 only discloses a low cost EL display device in which the manufacture cost is reduced because high price film such as a circular polarization film is avoided in favor of a reflecting surface of a cathode. Similarly, Applicants' co-pending Application No. 10/624,597 does not disclose "floating electrode lines formed on the main or sub substrate and connected to electrode lines on the remaining main or sub substrate" "wherein a plurality of the electrode lines on the main and sub substrates are electrically connected to each other by the conductive spacer" as generally defined in base claims 7, 25 and 26, and the

specific steps of manufacturing a dual-type organic EL display including "aging the main and sub organic EL devices" and "connecting flexible printed cables (FPCs) transmitting a drive signal to at least one of the main and sub substrate scan lines and/or at least one of the main and sub substrate data lines electrically connected to each other by the sealant" as defined in base claim 22. However, in the interest of expedition, a terminal disclaimer is enclosed to render this provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection moot and to place all claims in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney at the Washington DC office at (202) 216-9505 ext. 232.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 9/27/05

By: Hung H. Bui
Hung H. Bui
Registration No. 40,415

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510